



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/743,195	12/22/2003	Forrest Frank Hopkins	139681-2	6880

7590 05/02/2005

General Electric Company
CRD Patent Docket Rm 4A59
P.O. Box 8, Bldg. K-1
Schenectady, NY 12301

EXAMINER

SUCHECKI, KRISTYNA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2882

DATE MAILED: 05/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

28

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/743,195	HOPKINS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Krystyna Suchecki	2882	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-72 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-72 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1, 2, 5-15, 18-22, 25-35, 38-43, 45-48, 51-58, 61-70 and 72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for x-ray computed tomography systems and methods, does not reasonably provide enablement for detection systems not using tomographic techniques with x-rays. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. Applicant has attempted in the claims to encompass detection systems that are not disclosed. While disclosing x-ray specific sources and detectors, the scope of the claims allows for any radiation source or detector. The invention has not been enabled for any and all radiation types as claimed. For example, enablement has not been given for ultrasound or neutron radiation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1, 2, 5-22, 25-48, 51-58 and 61-71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Krug (US 5,838,758).

Art Unit: 2882

5. Regarding claims 1, 2, 5, 10, 11, 21, 22, 41, 42, 48, 58 and 68, Krug teaches a system and method for detecting an explosive with an article (Column 10, lines 18-25) comprising:

- a. An acquisition subsystem including a scanner and a computed tomography machine having a stationary radiation source and a stationary detector, said acquisition subsystem is adapted to acquire intensity measurements pertaining to the explosive (Column 13, line 58- Column 14, line 8);
- b. A reconstruction subsystem comprising a plurality of reconstruction stages, in communication with the acquisition subsystem, for generating view data from the intensity measurements and for reconstructing the view data into image data representative of the explosive (Column 19, line 20- Column 20, line 42);
- c. A computer-aided detection subsystem, comprising a plurality of computer-aided detection stages, for analyzing the image data (Column 16, lines 1-46);
- d. At least one additional source of information pertaining to the explosive, wherein the image data and the at least one additional source of information assist in identifying the explosive (Column 23, lines 11-58);
- e. An energy discriminating detector for discriminating between high-energy and low-energy signatures (Column 16, lines 1-7);
- f. Analyzing the reconstructed data to identify the object (Columns 23 and 24).

6. Regarding Claims 6, 8, 9, 30, 32, 33, 52, 53, 61, 63 and 64, Krug teaches a system and method where a plurality of reconstruction stages comprise one reconstruction stage including an algorithm adapted to reduce artifacts in the image data, one reconstruction stage including an algorithm adapted to compensate for noise in the acquired information and one reconstruction

Art Unit: 2882

stage including an algorithm adapted to iteratively and statistically reconstruct the image data (Column 16, lines 1-7; Column 21, lines 56-65; and Column 27, lines 9-15).

7. Regarding Claims 7, 31 and 62, Krug teaches a system and method wherein a reconstruction stage includes an algorithm adapted to vary the voxel size in the image data (Column 8, lines 43-50; Column 30, lines 1-43). Since a voxel is a volume of pixels, and Krug re-evaluates pixels across multiple slices dependent upon the explosive object's size, the voxel for evaluation is varied in the image data.

8. Regarding Claims 12-14, 34 and 54, Krug teaches a system and method wherein at least one of the plurality of computer-aided detection stages is in communication with any of the plurality of reconstruction stages and is adapted to receive the image data from one of the reconstruction stages, analyze the image data, and identify an area of interest within the image data, and is adapted to feedback image data of the area of interest to the reconstruction subsystem so that a reconstructed image can be analyzed to identify an explosive (Column 26, line 19- Column 17, line 15; and Column 29, line 21- Column 30, line 43).

9. Regarding Claims 15-17, 35-37, 43-44, 70 and 71, Krug teaches a system and method wherein the acquisition subsystem comprises an energy discriminating detector adapted to acquire energy sensitive measurements and provide additional information, which includes an assembly of two or more x-ray attenuating materials the signals from which can be processed in either a photon counting or a charge integration mode, or wherein the acquisition subsystem comprises at least one detector for detecting x-rays from at least two different energy spectra (Column 16, lines 25-38 and Column 31, lines 4-10).

Art Unit: 2882

10. Regarding claims 18, 19, 38, 39, 45, 46, 56, 57, 65 and 66, Krug teaches a system and method comprising an additional source of information comprising an alternative modality subsystem comprising one or more of the group consisting of a coherent scattering subsystem, and a trace detection subsystem (Column 6, lines 5-16 and Column 7, line 61- Column 8, line 23).

11. Regarding Claims 20, 40, 51 and 67 Krug teaches a system and method comprising a conveyor belt (5) for transporting the article to the acquisition subsystem.

12. Regarding Claims 25-27 and 55, Krug teaches a system and method wherein the acquisition subsystem is adapted to communicate the view data to the reconstruction subsystem, which is adapted to reconstruct the view data into the image data and communicate the image data to the computer-aided detection subsystem so that the computer aided detection subsystem is adapted to identify an area of interest within the image data and direct the reconstruction subsystem to re-reconstruct the image data for the area of interest (Column 26, lines 5-50 and Column 29, line 30- Column 30, line 43).

13. Regarding Claims 28 and 29, Krug teaches a system and method wherein an acquisition subsystem is adapted to communicate the view data to the computer-aided detection subsystem, which is adapted to identify an area of interest within the view data and direct the reconstruction subsystem to reconstruct the view data into image data for the area of interest (Column 26, lines 5-50 and Column 29, line 30- Column 30, line 43).

14. Regarding Claim 47, Krug teaches a system and method wherein at least one additional source of information comprises a risk variable subsystem (Column 23).

Art Unit: 2882

15. Regarding Claim 69, Krug teaches a method wherein the discriminating step comprises distinguishing between absorption coefficients originating from photoelectric and Compton scatter processes (Column 22, lines 10-20).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

16. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

17. Claims 3, 4, 23, 24, 49, 50, 59, 60 and 72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krug in view of Annis (US 6,628,745).

18. Regarding Claims 3, 4, 23, 24, 49, 50, 59 and 60, Krug teaches the use of a computed tomography system and method as above.

19. Krug fails to teach the use of a computed tomography machine comprising a vacuum housing chamber for generating an electron beam; a target for receiving the electron beam and emitting x-rays in response to the electron beam; a detector array located opposite the target for receiving the emitted x-rays; a source ring including a plurality of stationary x-ray sources; and a detector ring adjacent to the source ring and including a plurality of discrete detector modules.

20. Annis teaches several configurations of a computed tomography machine for scanning such things as luggage and humans, which are either scanned by the source, or scanned as a result of a conveyor moving the objects past the source and detector (Figures 4, 8 and 19). The configurations are made to replace systems where a single source creates a signal on a single line of detectors (Column 1). The configurations include a vacuum housing chamber (103, 303)

Art Unit: 2882

which generates an electron beam; a target (105) for receiving the electron beam and emitting x-rays in response to the electron beam; a detector array (108, 312) located opposite the target for receiving the emitted x-rays; a source ring including a plurality of stationary x-ray sources (302-309); and a detector ring (312) adjacent to the source ring and including a plurality of discrete detector modules. The configuration allows for protection of the electron beam source via the vacuum chamber (Columns 4 and 5) and allows for a source and detector ring to cooperate to replace blurred, single slice, single source and detector plane systems so that multiple slices of an object can be obtained for imaging (Column 1).

21. Therefor, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention were made to use the multi-source and multi- detector system of Annis in the system of Krug in order to obtain vacuum protection of an electron beam source (Annis, Columns 4 and 5) that can replace blurred, single slice, single source and detector plane systems so that multiple slices of an object can be obtained for imaging (Annis, Column 1). By duplicating the source and detector ring system for each of the high and low-energy source and detectors, Krug can benefit from the low-blur arrangement in both the high and low energy images.

22. Regarding Claim 72, Krug teaches a method for detecting an object as above.

23. Krug does not teach detecting an object within a human body.

24. Annis teaches that detection methods can be modified and used for several purposes such as luggage detection and human body scanning (Figures 4 and 19). The detection methods allow for displayed images of objects within humans and luggage, and most particularly, for fast scans of trauma patients (Column 2, lines 14-23 and Column 4, lines 9-25).

Art Unit: 2882

25. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the method of Krug as taught by Annis in order to quickly detect and display images of objects within traumatized humans (Annis, Column 2, lines 14-23 and Column 4, lines 9-25).

Conclusion

26. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Patent to McClelland (US 6,721,391) is of interest for teaching the use of threat files of passenger's luggage as part of a baggage screening system (Figure 14).

27. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Krystyna Suchecki whose telephone number is (571) 272-2495. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9-5.

28. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Glick can be reached on (571) 272-2490. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

29. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ks

Craig E Church

Craig E. Church
Primary Examiner